

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
November 27, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on November 27, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Glenn Farris letter in response to Cultural Resources Work Group Action Item C30,
Attachment 5	Draft Study Plans CUL.2, 3, and 4 – Cultural Resources Evaluation, Management, and Interpretive Evaluation

**Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

**Action Items – October 23, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the October 23, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #C30:</b>	Provide an inventory of artifacts removed during dam construction or information on accessing that information.
<b>Status:</b>	The facilitator read a letter received by Leslie Steidl, DPR, from Glenn Farris, Senior State Archaeologist with DPR, responding to this request. The letter outlines a method to request information from the Collections Research Facility and explains the necessary security that must be taken with that information. It also indicates that the NAGPRA inventories have been provided to the Secretary of the Interior and published in the Federal Register. The letter is included with this summary as Attachment 4.
<b>Action Item #C31:</b>	Provide comments on CUL.S.1 Study Plan to Janis Offermann, DWR.
<b>Status:</b>	Janis Offermann reported that she had not received any comments from the stakeholders.
<b>Action Item #C32</b>	Provide draft study plan for Issue Sheets CR 2, 3 and 4 to the Cultural Resource Work Group prior to their next meeting for Review.
<b>Status:</b>	Draft study plans were distributed to the Cultural Resources Work Group for discussion at this meeting.

### **Understanding of State Historic Preservation Office's Process and Section 106**

The participants requested that the agenda be revised so that the representative present from the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) could review the Section 106 process prior to the Study Plan review so participants would have a better understanding.

Dwight Dutschke from the OHP provided a brief history of federal preservation law, discussed the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act, described the elements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) relating to cultural resources, and described the roles of the OHP and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) in these processes. Mr. Dutschke also provided information on issues relevant to the establishment of the Area of Potential Effects.

One participant asked about State laws that parallel the federal law, and policies for State-controlled lands. Dwight responded by explaining the differences and overlap between State and federal law and the effort the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) takes at resource identification and evaluation.

Juanita Anglin expressed concern over the Section 106 process in regard to past broken promises made between the U.S. government and Native Americans. Dwight acknowledged her comment, suggested that her continued involvement was important to protect cultural resources in the Oroville area and assured her of the validity of the Section 106 process.

One participant commented on the African American population throughout time in Oroville, and asked how their history could be preserved in archives. Janis Offermann responded by explaining that oral histories of ethnic communities will be conducted as part of the ethnographic work.

### **Study Plan Review**

Draft Study Plans C2, C3, and C4 were distributed and are appended to this summary as Attachment 5. Steve Heipel of EDAW, Inc. (EDAW) provided the Cultural Resource Work Group with an overview of the draft study plans. He explained that each Study Plan builds upon the previous one. He explained that Study Plan C2 covers resource evaluation. Study Plan C3 covers cultural resource management, and Study Plan C4 covers resource interpretive evaluation.

One participant asked when the last ethnographic study was done in the Project area. Helen McCarthy, ethnographer, explained that no complete ethnographic study has been done for the Project area. She referenced the Handbook of North American Indians (1978) as having a compilation of previous studies. Steve commented that not enough ethnographic information is known to fulfill the Section 106 process at this point, and this needs to be addressed.

One participant suggested taking out the work 'public' on page 2 of Study Plan C2. He says they are not all public lands. Steve explained that the word 'public' suggests access to or from DWR land and possible easement issues. He also pointed out that DWR does not have the right to go onto private lands to do field studies without landowner permission.

One participant asked about the FERC license lifespan, and wondered if future potential historic listings are covered. Steve responded that the regulations clearly state that evaluations can change over time, and that part of the Management Plan will need to acknowledge the importance of possible future listings.

Eric Ritter of the BLM suggested the BLM be added into the section labeled Coordination with Other Resource Areas/ Studies on page 4 of Study Plan C2. Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors commented that when reviewing these Study Plans, they are looking for internal coordination and they feel that a consistent management protocol is needed.

One participant asked if they were going to wait until 2003 to protect resources in the area. Steve explained that some things could be taken care of sooner rather than later. One participant questioned whether the future displays would accurately depict the past. Steve responded that the desire is for an accurate depiction, suitable for the targeted age group for a particular exhibit or display.

He also mentioned a possible user survey to be implemented as part of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group studies could include questions designed to evaluate visitors' desires and/or opinions regarding possible future interpretive activities or facilities.

Craig Jones suggested that the participants agree to move the Study Plans forward for Plenary Group review, including a report on each study plan's development status. The Facilitator responded that the Study Plan Package would include a coordination chart, as well as a short abstract with status information for each study plan.

#### **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Progress Update**

Janis Offermann gave an update on Strawberry Valley involvement and mentioned an upcoming meeting on December 20, 2001 in which they hope to finalize the MOU. Art Angle gave an update on the formation of a Maidu Advisory Council and their efforts to establish a working government-to-government relationship between the DWR and the Federally recognized Tribes.

One participant requested the Cultural Resources Work Group be kept updated on the Maidu Advisory Council's progress. Art commented that regular progress reports would be given at the Cultural Resources Work Group meetings.

#### **Fluctuation Zone Task Force Update**

Michael Delacorte of CSU, Sacramento, reported that the consultants had met to consider issues involved in training courses and expected to be able to provide participants with information at the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting. They anticipate the first training to be a half-day session with an optional second half-day offered for those wishing additional hands-on experience. Eric Ritter of the BLM inquired about possible paleontology work and expressed a desire to be included in such work if possible.

**Next Meeting**

The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to meet:

Date: January 29, 2002  
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.  
Location: To be determined

**Agreements Made**

1. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to move the Draft Study Plans forward to the Plenary Group for review.

**Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

**Action Item #C33:** Provide the Federal Register Citation for NAGPRA, November 12, 1997.

**Responsible:** DWR Staff

**Due Date:** January 29, 2002

**Action Item #C34:** Provide an example of FERC Management Plan table of contents.

**Responsible:** DWR staff/ coordinate with Dwight Dutschke.

**Due Date:** January 29, 2002

**Action Item #35:** Move the Draft Study Plans forward to the Plenary Group.

**Responsible:** DWR Staff/ Consulting Team

**Due Date:** for distribution to Plenary December 11, 2001

### **Cultural Resources Work Group – November 27, 2001**

- Received presentation from Dwight Dutschke, Office of Historic Preservation, on the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and Area of Potential Effects.
- Reviewed and discussed draft Study Plans C2, C3 and C4 and recommended forwarding them to the Plenary Group for review.
- Updates:
  - Memorandum of Understanding: Janice Offermann gave an update on Strawberry Valley involvement and mentioned an upcoming meeting on December 20, 2001 in which they hope to finalize the MOU. Art Angle gave an update on the formation of the Tribal Advisory Council and their efforts to establish a working government-to-government relationship between the DWR and the Federally recognized Tribes.
  - Fluctuation Zone Task Force: Mike Selverston of CSU, Sacramento, reported that the consultants had met to consider issues involved in training courses and expected to be able to provide participants with information at the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting.
- Next Work Group Meeting: January 29, 2002, 5:30 –9:30 PM, location to be determined.